REMARKS

Claims 36-70 are pending in the application. Claims 36-70 stand rejected. Applicants request further review and examination in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 36-42, 48-55, and 61-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,905,987 to Shutt in view of "Access 97 Bible' by Prague. Claims 43-47, 56-60, and 68-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shutt and Prague and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0037412 to Miloushev. Applicants traverse these rejections.

The Office Action admits that Shutt fails to teach or suggest an "operating system that comprises a file system integrated with a database management program, data for one or more applications, wherein the operating system uses the database management program to generate objects for the data and the file system to store the file streams for the objects" in turns to Prague to cure Shutt's deficiencies. The Office Action states that the subject matter described above are "merely processes that occur in database systems running in convention [sic] operating systems which is [sic] well known in the art" (Office Action at p. 4) and Prague "describes an operating system that comprises a file system integrated with a database management program." (Office Action at p. 4). Applicants submit that the file system of Prague is not integrated with a database management program. The portion cited by the Examiner states that since Microsoft makes both Access and Windows the products will work together. (Prague at p. 3). This is irrelevant to the claimed subject matter because it is not remotely related to database and file system integration. Moreover, a disclosure of "Using OLE ... objects in Windows 95 ... you can extend Access into being a true database operating environment" (Prague at p. 3) is also irrelevant because it merely discloses how to make Access work better. This is unrelated to modifying an operating system. Finally, a disclosure of Access database objects (Prague at p. 675) is irrelevant because there is no teaching or suggestion that the database is part of the operating system.

Access 97 is a database management system that stores and retrieves data. Access 97 stores data in a container which is a file having a .mdb file extension. When the .mdb files

are saved they are saved using the save API of the operating system. That is, *Access and the operating system are separate programs*. The Operating system writes to the hardware storage device and records the physical locations indicative of the .mdb file(s) in a table such as a NTFS table. To say that Prague's Access is 'integrated' with the file system is incorrect. The file system stores information that represents files that can be interpreted by an executing instance of an Access program. Access is not 'integrated' with the file system just like applications that can read .txt, .jpeg, .ppt, or .doc files are not integrated with the file system. In would be nonsensical to say that instructions indicative of a file system, instructions that are effectuated in the kernel of an operating system, are 'integrated' with a digital picture just because the instructions that effectuate both are stored on accessible data storage.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the operating system described in the cited art does not <u>use</u> a database management program to generate anything. At most Prague describes Access using the operating system to store data and schedule threads of execution. Prague does not describe an operating system that <u>uses</u> Access to do anything. Accordingly, for at least these reasons Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1.

Independent claims 49 and 61 recite similar elements to those in claim 36 and patentably define over the art of record for at least similar reasons as claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 49 and 61.

Dependent claims 37-48, 50-60, and 62-70 depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 26, 49, or 61 and patentably define over the art of record for at least the reason describe above with respect to claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 37-48, 50-60, and 62-70.

CONCLUSION

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and issue a Notice of

Allowance of all the claims.

Date: November 18, 2008   /David M. Platz/
                                               David M. Platz
                                               Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439